

An on-site Special Study Meeting of the Troy City Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Chamberlain at 6:00 P.M. on Tuesday, June 4, 2002 at Long Lake and Dequindre.

1. ROLL CALL

Present

Chamberlain  
Vleck  
Starr  
Kramer  
Storrs  
Waller  
Littman

Absent

Pennington  
Wright

**Also Present**

Mark Miller, Planning Director  
Susan Lancaster, Assistant City Attorney  
Brent Savidant, Principal Planner

RESOLUTION

Moved by Chamberlain

Seconded by Waller

RESOLVED, that Ms. Pennington and Mr. Wright be excused from attendance at this meeting.

Yeas

All Present (7)

Absent

Pennington  
Wright

MOTION CARRIED

2. A walkthrough of the Long Lake and Dequindre area was conducted by the Planning Commission and staff.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

4. ADJOURN

The walkthrough meeting concluded at 6:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Miller AICP/PCP  
Planning Director

*Minutes for Special Study Meeting of the Troy Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Chamberlain at 7:30 P.M. on June 4, 2002, in the Lower Level Conference Room of the Troy City Hall on following pages:*

The Special/Study Meeting of the Troy City Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Chamberlain at 7:30 P.M. on Tuesday, June 4, 2002, in the Lower Level Conference Room of the Troy City Hall.

1. ROLL CALL

**Present:**

Chamberlain  
Storrs  
Kramer  
Starr  
Waller  
Vleck  
Littman

**Absent**

Pennington  
Wright

**Also Present:**

Mark Miller, Planning Director  
Susan Lancaster, Assistant City Attorney  
Jordan Keoleian, Student Representative

Moved by Starr

Seconded by Vleck

RESOLVED, that Ms. Pennington and Mr. Wright be excused from attendance at this meeting.

**Yeas**

All Present (7)

**Absent**

Pennington  
Wright

MOTION CARRIED

**STUDY ITEMS**

2. LAND USE AND ZONING STUDY (#36) – Long Lake and Dequindre

Mr. Chamberlain stated that we just finished our walkthrough at Long Lake and Dequindre and we will go around the table and get each individual's thoughts and comments.

Mr. Kramer stated we are addressing a lot of concerns that are not the Planning Commission's responsibility, i.e., Ordinance enforcement.

Mr. Storrs stated there should be something in the ordinance regarding lighting where you would not be able to see the hot spots at the property lines. He also commented on the dumpsters at the Troy Library being enclosed; however, the gates are left opened.

Mr. Chamberlain stated our primary purpose of this walkthrough were curb cuts, especially on the Troy side.

Mr. Waller commented on curb cuts, grates, and possible traffic flow. It is an old intersection, buildings are dated and in general disrepair with piles of trash. Detroit Edison recently installed a pole and left trash in a field. I don't know what it is we could do to make the property owners proud of what they have.

Mr. Littman stated that the cross access with Arby's and the Cranberry House works well.

Mr. Chamberlain asked Mr. Miller what properties should have cross access and where are they at.

Mr. Littman stated that Arby's curb cut is very confusing and dangerous. Also, that Rochester Road has many dumpster problems.

Mr. Vleck stated that if cross-access easement was between the gas station and Walgreen's was opened the gas station may not have enough parking.

Mr. Starr stated that the Dequindre frontage, north of Long Lake, that the curb cuts were to be replaced two for one; however, it never happened. We need to make sure those things happen. He stated he would like to see some individual creative comments about getting rid of the curb cuts.

Ms. Lancaster stated that the south side of Long Lake was much better as far as traffic flow and curb cuts.

Mr. Savident stated that the intersection is one of the gateways into Troy from the east and with enhancement, it could be turned into a positive.

Mr. Miller stated the City cannot consolidate the properties. What we can do is apply the Zoning Ordinance when a site plan comes in. At that time we can encourage consolidation of driveways. That's really all we can do.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that curb cuts and detention need to be addressed. We are looking to City Staff to provide information on who owns those properties, where the cross access easements are, where we would want cross access, and where to eliminate cuts on the northwest side. We need to get discussions started on how we can improve the dumpster situation in this city. We need to find a way to force people, whatever the penalty may be, which has to be stiff

enough, so that they will build enclosures and place the dumpsters in them. The current language on dumpsters needs to be reviewed and proposed changes given to the Planning Commission and City Council in order that we may advise the residents of Troy in such a manner that they will want to clean this up. It is getting out of hand. Also, these buildings are facing residential areas and we need to do something in our Ordinance so that the residents aren't looking at cinder block walls. We need to put a plan in place on how we are going to get a handle on this, for now and in the future, whether we are still here or not.

Mr. Chamberlain also stated that Arby's has a problem with a planter in the driveway and this can partially be resolved.

### 3. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT REPORT

Mr. Miller stated that there was a meeting today regarding the DDA and the June 19, 2002, six (6) hour session, where a number of experts will address the evolution of metro areas and suburban areas and their decline. They will then summarize all input and their intent is to come out of that meeting with a resolution on whether the DDA is or is not going forward in support of a conference center. This will be the only issue at this meeting.

Mr. Storrs asked what was the date set for the DDA meeting.

Mr. Miller stated it will be June 19, 2002.

### 4. SITE PLAN REVIEW (SP-868) – Proposed Section 1 Golf Course, South side of South Blvd. and East of John R, Section 1 – C-F

Mr. Miller stated that the petitioner submitted application packets after the deadline. Therefore, a redlined version of the site plan is provided. An additional complete site plan review package should be provided at the meeting. The Planning Department will prepare a report and analysis for the site plan that is scheduled for the June 11, 2002 regular meeting.

Carol Anderson, Director of Parks and Recreation, stated that the development team is planning to update plans based on what you have in front of you this evening. We are here to address concerns that the City may have. We have two (2) separate Site Plan Approval packages. One is for the golf course and a separate site plan for the parking lot, clubhouse, cart storage and a barn maintenance building on the north property line.

Mr. Kramer asked if the drive is wide enough for two (2) cars.

Mr. Klingensmith stated yes.

Mr. Waller stated that the area to the north of the maintenance shed will have outdoor storage of sand and dirt. He asked if that was going to be along the side to the west.

Mr. Klingensmith stated no, that on the parking lot, the dumpster enclosure is there and three (3) storage bins for your top dressing, sand, top soil, etc., that is also enclosed. It will not be visible to customer traffic or the general public.

Mr. Storrs asked what is the screening to the residents to the west.

Mr. Miller stated that it was his understanding a landscape buffer will be provided. However, a variance is needed because a wall is required to provide a buffer from the parking area.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that he thought that the Commission had changed the Ordinance to all wall or landscaping.

Mr. Starr asked if they were planning on any lighting.

Mr. Klingensmith stated yes, parking lighting.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that we need a lighting plan.

Mr. Littman asked about chemicals being used.

Mr. Parks stated the type of chemicals being used cannot end up with stormwater runoff. The newer type of chemicals adhere very quickly, do their job, and breakdown very quickly. The possibility of these chemicals running down in these sensitive areas is very limited.

Ms. Anderson stated that we don't arbitrarily put insecticides or pesticides on the golf course. Residents use more fertilizer on their home lawns. We use the best management practices to address these issues.

Mr. Vleck questioned under whose authorization is there work being done at this time on this site.

Ms. Anderson stated there is work being done on the site and the reason for that is that we wanted to get this project started as quickly as possible and approved by City Council.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that the City can't live with their own rules.

Ms. Anderson stated that we are not looking for you to rubber stamp the site plan, we are looking for your input.

Mr. Chamberlain asked why do we even sit here and talk about this. If a citizen or private developer was doing what this, they would be fined.

Mr. Treadwell stated that the work on this site needed to be done regardless of the golf course because the landfill caps need to be fixed.

Ms. Lancaster stated there are a couple of things that are different in this particular project. This was bid out by the City and the Planning Commission doesn't normally get involved in this process. The City signed a contract and they are bound by that contract. In addition, the Engineering Department has a right to do preliminary work on site without a Site Plan approval. They are, of course, accountable for what they are doing. The Planning Commission is reviewing this for Zoning Ordinance compliance related to the site plan, then makes a recommendation to City Council regarding the site plan. This is a little bit of a different animal.

Mr. Chamberlain stated we have already got the contract so we are not going to make any changes.

Ms. Lancaster stated that the Zoning Ordinance gives the Planning Commission input regarding a site plan approval recommendation.

Ms. Anderson stated that The site plan can be changed. The Planning Commission's input will be considered and the Site Plan revised where necessary.

Mr. Storrs asked what is the contract for, the whole project.

Ms. Anderson stated yes.

Mr. Vleck stated that he personally thinks this stinks. Other citizens and private developers would love to come in and get started on their plans immediately too, but they have to wait for approval from the Commission.

Mr. Waller stated that there are two (2) landfills. There is one to the west and one to the East, the Fonz. Were there cap problems at these landfills. Weren't there methane gas problems there also. Have these problems been resolved.

Mr. Treadwill stated that the City has already installed methane gas vents on the west property and that the golf course will have a methane collection field system.

Ms. Anderson stated there were three (3) landfills capped and closed under different regulations.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that it probably met the current regulations in 1975.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that he gave Jordan Keoleian, Student Representative for the Planning Commission, a task to look at the golf course and do some research as to how people his age would look at this.

Mr. Keoleian presented to the Planning Commission the research he had done on that subject and followed up with a number of topics and questions. He stated that this golf course is really good for the City. He believes that the golf course should look into receiving Audubon Signature status. That this is very prestigious. It would integrate really well with the City and the Community. Everything is environmentally sound. This is new. This is Troy. If we are going to have a creme de la creme golf course, we should have Audubon Signature status to go with it. It would draw a lot of people.

Ms. Anderson stated that the Audubon has two programs, Sanctuary and Signature and the City would probably have to do this as a sanctuary. That in order to get certification one way or another depends on where they are in the process of the project planning.

Mr. Keoleian asked if the City was interested in Signature status.

Ms. Anderson stated the City follows the golf course industry's best practices.

Mr. Keoleian stated that he would think that the City would want to get Audubon approval.

Ms. Anderson stated that costs are a factor. We did not intend for the golf course to be a Signature golf course.

Mr. Chamberlain asked what would be the costs.

Ms. Anderson stated that's the problem. We don't know.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that the City should do this because we really need to make Troy a Signature place and that this would be one way that could be accomplished. We would really like to see this all come together. We should be the City of tomorrow.

Mr. Treadwell stated that this discussion did occur and also stated that this site is unique in many ways. We have 175 acres and of that 175 acres there is approximately 40 acres of non landfill, and 25 acres are ponds. There is not much habitat and we have no idea what the requirements are. We could get certification after the project is completed if the City so desired. The idea behind this was if the City chooses in a year or two to get this Audubon Signature, the site will be prepared for this. To get it now would unduly delay the project.



Mr. Storrs asked about the wall by the maintenance building and potentially replacing it with a berm and landscaping. It would be neat if the clubhouse could also serve the softball field with a bare-minimum walkway to the softball field. Is there a plan to put a walkway in the northwest corner of the softball area.

Ms. Anderson stated there hasn't been any consideration for that up to this point. As an operations person, softball and beer is a common thing.

Mr. Kramer asked about the wall on the west property line and suggested that the whole area be buffered. He stated that he once got hit by a golf ball from the Sylvan Glen gold course and that we need to prevent anyone from being hit and precautions need to be taken. He also asked how the golf course was going to get all of its irrigation.

Mr. Treadwell stated that the City dug a pond 10-15 years ago and this should be sufficient for irrigation.

Mr. Kramer asked if enough room has been allowed for expansion of the parking lot if needed.

Mr. Starr asked what about the noise that is too close to the residents to the west. What can they expect there. It is a residential area.

Mr. Miller stated that area will eventually be developed.

Ms. Lancaster commented on the Audubon issue and stated that a lot to do with the reason why this might not be a Signature golf course right away is because of the landfill. She also asked if this is to be a carts only golf course.

Mr. Treadwell stated that it is a cart only golf course because of the 75 foot hill and it would be very difficult to walk.

Ms. Lancaster stated that Audubon certification was not included in the bid even though this Commission has an incredible gift of giving tremendous input. City Council needs your recommendation and that is what this Commission is here for. City Council feels this Commission has this skill.

Mr. Starr stated that the cart got put before the horse.

Mr. Vleck asked what the proximity of the greens are on the west side of the property and are they cut every day. He also reiterates his stand with being upset with the way this process goes.

Mr. Waller suggested that this be brought back to the Commission with a landscaping plan. He is concerned about golf balls along the far west and also

about the noise to residents to the west. He asked about the process for Audubon sanctuary and commented on his hopefulness of this being accomplished.

Mr. Kramer stated that a rough guess of about 200 parking spaces are provided for and asked if you had a scramble with about 12 people per hole, you might want to take a look at how to expand your parking if needed.

Mr. Schultz stated that from what he has read about Audubon certification, since we aren't building the golf course, it would be up to the City to obtain estimates as to the cost. He agrees that Audubon certification with this golf course is an opportunity to go first class.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that this will be heard on the 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday of the month, June 25, 2002.

## 5. INFILL P.U.D. REVISIONS

Mr. Miller stated that the Commission needs to set the direction they feel they want to consider. People are coming forward to develop smaller pieces of property. Eventually, the Future Land Use Plan should have some kind of criteria as to where they should be placed. The PUD should be in conformance with the Future Land Use Plan. A 10 acre requirement is not recommended as Dick Carlisle stated earlier.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that they wanted the PUD limited.

Mr. Vleck stated that housing requirements demand our community change. Baby Boomers are looking to move out of their homes. They no longer want the upkeep or the maintenance.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that a PUD can be anything from commercial to residential. It depends on the way it's written. If we let it go less than ten (10) acres we are going to be looking at every zoning district in the City.

Mr. Keoleian stated that a PUD should be very rare. In making it less than ten (10) acres is a bad idea. Infill projects should go along with the surrounding area. Having a PUD be a rarity is better.

Mr. Littman stated that he personally sees no problem with going back to five (5) acres; however, he would not want to see it go any less than five (5) acres.

Mr. Waller stated that we should have an escape clause in the language that if the requirement satisfies all other expectations of the PUD and is less than ten (10) acres, it can be presented to the Commission through the review process. We cause changes to be made hoping changes are to the betterment.

Collectively, this body has the history and experience to allow something less than the ten (10) acres to come in for consideration. We make recommendations to City Council. We should at least have the ability to consider what someone might have to propose.

Mr. Storrs stated that the more we screw around with this, the less I am in favor of this escape clause. I'm for sticking with the ten (10) acres. He stated that maybe we should look at the Master Plan as to where things should be applied.

Mr. Kramer stated that overall we have extremely good luck with the developers of this City. He stated he was still on the side of the fence that the Zoning Ordinance is appropriate. The Future Land Use Plan serves a purpose in orderly development and not as a tool for the Planning Commission to limit themselves.

Mr. Starr stated that the major reason for the ten (10) acre requirement was because we wanted the individual to accumulate property in order to do a good job. A ten (10) acre minimum is what works.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that he is with the ten (10) acre requirement all the way. This should be a rarity, not an every day occurrence. However, we do have a problem with some parts of the City, but he believes these can be handled with overlay plans. There are some things he would like to see if there are some places in the City to work out with overlay plans. We ought to start on Maple Road.

Mr. Kramer stated that there are a couple of things that tie a lot of things together, i.e., Long Lake and Dequindre as a gateway. He also stated that we need to encourage property owner's cooperation.

6. REVISED DESIGN STANDARDS FOR DETENTION BASINS

Mr. Vandette, City Engineer, will be available for discussions on June 25, 2002.

7. UNIFIED SITE DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY DISTRICT

Delayed.

8. PUBLIC HEARING - PROPOSED PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD-1) – Proposed Troy Baptist Church/Robertson Brothers P.U.D., East side of Rochester and South of South Blvd., Section 2 – R-1D

Mr. Miller stated that the package from Troy Baptist Church and Robertson Brothers was received in the Planning Department last night, June 3, 2002, at

4:30 p.m. which was not enough time to review and have ready for the meeting this evening.

Tad Kreger, Architect, stated that they have put together a ten (10) page package to help further define the character of the development. They are also redesigning the pedestrian circulation and by rotating the buildings it has given us a lot more green space. We have very extensive landscaping plans.

Mr. Littman asked how wide are the sidewalks.

Mr. Kreger stated five (5) feet.

Mr. Kramer commented to Mr. Kreger that when he comes back, give us a warm and fuzzy feeling that these sidewalks, fences, and pole areas are low maintenance.

Mr. Starr asked about lighting and commented that you had talked about bringing it down.

Mr. Kreger stated that is right.

Mr. Waller commented on segregating the north and south use driveways.

Mr. Littman stated his concern with only one entrance.

Mr. Johnston stated that their new name is now Woodside Bible Church and that the fire department wants two (2) entrances.

Mr. Waller stated he would like to see some sort of breakaway gate in case a fire truck needs to get through. There needs to be a way for a fire truck to get from the church parking lot to the residential area.

Mr. Chamberlain stated there are churches with gated drives.

Mr. Clarke stated we need to address emergency cross access.

Mr. Vleck stated his only question is the wetland area.

Mr. Clarke stated that the residents to the north want a 35 to 50 foot setback.

Mr. Waller stated that emergency cross access is needed.

Mr. Kramer asked about pedestrian access to Emerald Lakes area.

Mr. Chamberlain asked about the distance from the garage to the sidewalk without obstructing the sidewalk to ensure there was enough parking.

Mr. Kreger stated 23 feet.

Mr. Chamberlain stated that the public hearing will continue on the second Tuesday in July.

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comments.

Adjourned at 10:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Miller AICP/PCP  
Planning Director